

*[No Minutes Were Generated on Monday, January 17, 2000,  
Due to the Court's Observance of Martin Luther King, Jr.'s Day.]*

115

**SUPREME COURT MINUTES  
TUESDAY, JANUARY 18, 1999  
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA**

S084998      Dalton P. Lolohea, Petitioner  
                         v.  
                         Contra Costa County Superior Court, Respondent  
                         People, Real Party in Interest  
                         Application for stay and petition for writ of mandate DENIED.

6th Dist.      People, Respondent  
H016421      v.  
S072166      Gary Edmund Strehlow, Appellant  
                         The order filed on October 20, 1999, is hereby modified to read,  
                         in its entirety:  
                         “Appellant’s petition for review DENIED.”

3rd Dist.      Owen Waltrip Jr., Petitioner  
C033444      v.  
S084338      Workers’ Compensation Appeals Board et al., Respondents  
                         The time for granting or denying review in the above cause is  
                         hereby extended to and including March 2, 2000, or the date upon  
                         which review is either granted or denied. This order is entered nunc  
                         pro tunc as of January 2, 2000, due to clerical error.

6th Dist.      Jeremy T., Petitioner  
H020606      v.  
S083591      Santa Cruz County Superior Court, Respondent  
                         People, Real Party in Interest  
                         The time for granting or denying review in the above cause is  
                         hereby extended to and including February 10, 2000, or the date  
                         upon which review is either granted or denied. This order is entered  
                         nunc pro tunc as of January 14, 2000, due to clerical error.

S029460 People, Respondent

v.

Randall Scott Cash, Appellant

On application of respondent and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file respondent's brief is extended to and including February 7, 2000.

S034110 People, Respondent

v.

Mark Christopher Crew, Appellant

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's opening brief is extended to and including March 20, 2000.

S041008 People, Respondent

v.

Jaime Armando Hoyos, Appellant

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the appellant is granted to and including March 20, 2000, to request correction of the record on appeal. Counsel for appellant is ordered to notify the Clerk of the Supreme Court in writing as soon as the act as to which the Court has granted an extension of time has been completed.

S042659 People, Respondent

v.

Joseph Lloyd Cook, Appellant

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the appellant is granted to and including March 14, 2000, to request correction of the record on appeal. Counsel for appellant is ordered to notify the Clerk of the Supreme Court in writing as soon as the act as to which the Court has granted an extension of time has been completed.

No further extensions of time are contemplated.

S050102 People, Respondent

v.

Paul Hensley, Appellant

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the appellant is granted to and including March 27, 2000, to request correction of the record on appeal. Counsel for

appellant is ordered to notify the Clerk of the Supreme Court in writing as soon as the act as to which the Court has granted an extension of time has been completed.

S067491      In re Ronald Harold Seaton  
                 on  
                 Habeas Corpus

On application of respondent and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file respondent's informal response to the petition for writ of habeas corpus is extended to and including March 7, 2000.

No further extensions of time are contemplated.

S080159      In re Keith Lamont Smith  
                 on  
                 Habeas Corpus

On application of the Attorney General and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file informal response is extended to and including January 31, 2000.

S083545      In re **Joan Baumgarten** on Discipline

It is ordered that **Joan Baumgarten, State Bar No. 108909** be suspended from the practice of law for two years and until she has shown proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of her rehabilitation, fitness to practice and learning and ability in the general law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii), Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct, that execution of suspension be stayed, and that she be placed on probation for two years subject to the conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its order approving stipulation filed September 15, 1999. It is further ordered that she take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) Costs are awarded to the State Bar pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6140.7.

S083546 In re **Steven R. Finch** on Discipline

It is ordered that **Steven R. Finch, State Bar No. 80033** be suspended from the practice of law for two years and until he has shown proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of his rehabilitation, fitness to practice and learning and ability in the general law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii), Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct, that execution of suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for three years, on condition that he be actually suspended for one year. He is also ordered to comply with the other conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its order approving stipulation filed August 24, 1999. It is further ordered that he take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) It is further ordered that he comply with rule 955, California Rules of Court, and that he perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 days, respectively, after the date this order is effective.\* Costs are awarded to the State Bar pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6140.7.

\*(See Business & Professions Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)

S083551 In re **Robert H. Barnhill** on Discipline

It is ordered that **Robert H. Barnhill, State Bar no. 46513**, be suspended from the practice of law for two years and until he has shown proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of his rehabilitation, fitness to practice and learning and ability in the general law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii), Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct, that execution of suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for two years on condition that he be actually suspended for 60 days. He is also ordered to comply with the other conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its decision or order approving stipulation filed August 31, 1999. It is further ordered that he take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) Costs are awarded to the State Bar pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6140.7.

S083552      In re **Kathy Lynn Holder** on Discipline

It is ordered that **Kathy Lynn Holder**, State Bar No. 153045, be suspended from the practice of law for five years and until she has shown proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of her rehabilitation, fitness to practice and learning and ability in the general law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii), Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct, and until she makes restitution to the Client Security Fund in the amount of \$1,095.00, plus 10% interest per annum from May 19, 1997, and furnishes satisfactory proof thereof to the Probation Unit, State Bar Office of Trial Counsel; that execution of suspension be stayed; and that she be placed on probation for five years on condition that she be actually suspended for three years and until she shows proof of her rehabilitation, fitness to practice and learning and ability in the general law and makes restitution as described above. She is further ordered to comply with the other conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its Order Approving Stipulation filed September 23, 1999. It is also ordered that she provide proof of passage of the August 13, 1999, Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year of the effective date of this order or that she take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination during the period of her actual suspension or within one year of the effective date of this order, whichever is longer. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) She is further ordered to comply with rule 955, California Rules of Court, and perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 days, respectively, after the date this order is effective.\* Costs are awarded to the State Bar pursuant to Bus. & Prof. Code section 6086.10 and payable in accordance with Bus. & Prof. Code section 6140.7.

\*(See Business & Professions Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)

S083554      In re **John Wallace Larson** on Discipline

It is ordered that **John Wallace Larson**, State Bar No. 30700 be suspended from the practice of law for two years and until he has shown proof satisfactory to the State Bar Court of his rehabilitation, fitness to practice and learning and ability in the general law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii), Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct, that execution of suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for two years on condition of nine

months actual suspension. He is also ordered to comply with the other conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its order approving stipulation filed October 12, 1999. Credit toward the period of actual suspension shall be given for the period of interim suspension which commenced on April 2, 1999. (*In re Young* (1989) 49 Cal.3d 257, 270.) It is further ordered that he take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) Costs are awarded to the State Bar pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6140.7.

S083555 In re **Norman A. Lewin** on Discipline

It is ordered that **Norman A. Lewin, State Bar No. 123734** be suspended from the practice of law for 90 days, that execution of suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for one year subject to the conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its order approving stipulation filed September 15, 1999. It is further ordered that he take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order. (See *Segretti v. State Bar* (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) Costs are awarded to the State Bar pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 6086.10 and payable in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6140.7.